

FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS Eastern Division

APR 04 2016	
THOMAS G. BRUTON CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COU	R٦

FRANCISCO CHAVEZ,	
Plaintiff,	
	CIVIL ACTION
v.)	Case No.
ILLINOIS AUTO ELECTRIC CO.	1:16-cv-03979
d/b/a ILLINOIS AUTO CENTRAL,	Judge Joan H. Lefkow
Defendants.)	Magistrate Judge Sidney I. Schenkier

COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

- 1. This is an action for employment discrimination.
- 2. The plaintiff is FRANCISCO CHAVEZ of the county of Will in the state of Illinois.
- 3. The defendant is ILLINOIS AUTO ELECTRIC CO. d/b/a ILLINOIS AUTO CENTRAL, whose street address is 700 Enterprise Dr., Aurora, DuPage, IL 60504 (630) 862-3300.
- The plaintiff sought employment or was employed by the defendant at 4750 S.
 Central Ave., Chicago, IL 60638.
- 5. The plaintiff [check one box]
 - $(a)\square$ was denied employment by the defendant.
 - $(b)\square$ was hired and is still employed by the defendant.
 - (c) \square was employed but is no longer employed by the defendant.
- 6. The defendant discriminated against the plaintiff on or about, or beginning on or about February 6, 2015.

	7.1	(Choose	parag	raph	7.1 c	or 7.2	do no	t compi	lete bot	h.)
--	-----	---------	-------	------	-------	--------	-------	---------	----------	-----

(a) the defendant is not a federal governmental agency, and the plaint	iff
[check one box] \square has not \square has filed a charge or charges against the defendant asserting	ng
the acts of discrimination indicated in this complaint with any of the following	ng
government agencies:	
(i) ☑ the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, on or about	ui
November 9, 2015.	
(ii) □the Illinois Department of Human Rights, on or about (mont	h)
(day)(year)	
(b)If charges were filed with an agency indicated above, a copy of the	he
charge is attached.	14
days.	
It is the policy of both the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Illino	is
Department of Human Rights to cross-file with the other agency all charges received. The	he
plaintiff has no reason to believe that this policy was not followed in this case.	
7.2 The defendant is a federal governmental agency, and	
(a) the plaintiff previously filed a Complaint of Employment Discrimination	on
with the defendant asserting the acts of discrimination indicated in this court complaint.	
□Yes (month)(day)(year)	
□No, did not file Complaint of Employment Discrimination	
(b) The plaintiff received a Final Agency Decision of	on
(month) (day) (year)	

•	(c) Attached is a copy of the
	(i) Complaint of Employment Discrimination,
	☐ YES ☐ NO, but a copy will be filed within 14 days.
	(ii) Final Agency Decision
	☐YES ☐NO, but a copy will be filed within 14 days.
8.	(Complete paragraph 8 only if defendant is not a federal governmental agency.)
	(a) The United States Equal Employee Opportunity Commission has no
	issued a Notice to Right to Sue.
	(b) ☐ the United States Equal Employment Opportunity commission has issue
	a Notice of Right to Sue, which was received by the plaintiff on December 7
	2015. SEE EXHIBIT A.
9.	The defendant discriminated against the plaintiff because of the plaintiff's [check
	only those that apply]:
	(a) ☑ Age (Age Discrimination Employment Act).
	(b)□Color (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C §1981).
	(c) Disability (Americans with Disabilities Act or Rehabilitation Act)
	(d) ■ National Origin (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C
	§1981).
	(e) Race (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C §1981).

(f)□Religion (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964)

(g)□Sex (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964)

10.	if the defendant is a state, county, municipal (city, town or village) or other
	local governmental agency, plaintiff further alleges discrimination on the basis
	of race, color, or national origin (42 U.S.C. §1983).

11. Jurisdiction over the statutory violation alleged is conferred as follows: for Title VII claims by 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343(a)(3), and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3); for 42 U.S.C. §1981 and §1983 by 42 U.S.C. §1988; for the A.D.E.A.by 42 U.S.C. §12117; for the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. §791

12.	The defendant [check only those that apply]					
	(a)□	failed to hire the plaintiff.				
	(b) 	terminated the plaintiff's employment.				
	(c)□	failed to promote the plaintiff.				
	(d)□	failed to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's religion.				
	(e)□	failed to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's disabilities.				
	(f) ☑	failed to stop harassment.				
	(g) ☑	retaliated against the plaintiff because the plaintiff did something to assert rights				
		protected by the laws identified in paragraphs 9 and 10 above;				
	(h)□	other(specify):				
13.	The fa	cts supporting the plaintiff's claim of discrimination are as follows:				
	PLEASE SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT B.					

14.	[AGE DISCRIMINATION ONLY] Defendant knowingly, intentionally, and willfully
discrii	ninated against the plaintiff.

- 15. The plaintiff demands that be case be tried by a jury. □YES ☑NO
- 16. THEREFORE, the plaintiff asks that the court grant the following relief to the plaintiff [check only those that apply]
- (a)□ Direct the defendant to hire the plaintiff.
- (b)□ Direct the defendant to re-employ the plaintiff.
- (c)□ Direct the defendant to promote the plaintiff.
- (d) Direct the defendant to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's religion.
- (e) Direct the defendant to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's disabilities.
- (f) Direct the defendant to (specify): Compensate for wage, vacation, overtime union benefits and insurance loss
- (g). If available, grant the plaintiff appropriate injunctive relief, lost wages, liquidated/double damages, front pay, compensatory damages, punitive damages, prejudgment interest, post-judgment interest, and costs, including reasonable attorney fees and expert witness fees.
- (h) ☐ Grant such other relief as the Court may find appropriate.

(Plaintiff's signature)

(Plaintiff's name)

Case: 1:16-cv-03979 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/04/16 Page 6 of 10 PageID #:6

Francisco Chavez						
(Plainti	ff's street address))				
688 Tal	lgrass Drive		······································	-		
(City)	Bolingbrook	(State) IL	(ZIP)_	60440		
(Plaintit	ff's telenhone nun	nher) (630) 739-79	153			

Case: 1:16-cv-03979 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/04/16 Page 7 of 10 PageID #:7

EEOC Form 161 (11/09)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

EEOC FORM (61)	(1003)				
		DISMISSAL AN	D NOTICE OF	RIGHTS	
688 T	cisco Chavez` allgrass Drive gbrook, IL 60440		From:	Chicago District Offic 500 West Madison St Suite 2000 Chicago, IL 60661	e ·
		rson(s) aggrieved whose ider L (29 CFR §1601.7(a))	ntity is		
EEOC Charg	e No.	EEOC Representative			Telephone No.
		Sergio Maldonado			(242) 000 0420
440-2016-		Investigator Supp			(312) 869-8129
THE EEO	C IS CLOSING ITS FIL				
	The facts alleged in the	charge fail to state a claim	under any of the	statutes enforced by the EE	COC.
	Your allegations did not	involve a disability as defi	ned by the Americ	ans With Disabilities Act.	
	The Respondent employ	ys less than the required r	number of employe	es or is not otherwise cover	red by the statutes.
	discrimination to file you	ır charge			the date(s) of the alleged
X	مماله مسامقيات بالافارات في الم	inhlighes violations at the	ctatutes inis on	nvestigation, the EEOC is es not certify that the respo e construed as having been	unable to conclude that the ondent is in compliance with raised by this charge.
	The EEOC has adopted	I the findings of the state of	or local fair employ	ment practices agency that	investigated this charge.
	Other (briefly state)				
		- NOTICE	OF SUIT RIGH	ITS - to this form.)	
Discrimin You may f	ation in Employment	sabilities Act, the Gen Act: This will be the on respondent(s) under for DAYS of your receipt	etic Information by notice of dismederal law based of this notice;	Nondiscrimination Actissal and of your right to on this charge in federa or your right to sue base	or state court. Your
alleged EF	Act (EPA): EPA suits PA underpayment. This u file suit may not be o	means that backpay d	or state court wit ue for any violat	hin 2 years (3 years for water that occurred mor	villful violations) of the re than 2 years (3 years)
		In	behalf of the Cor	nmission	12/2/15
Enclosures	(s)		anne Bowman, strict Director		(Date Mailed)
cc. II	LUNOIS AUTO FLECT				

ILLINOIS AUTO ELECTRIC CC c/o H. Bruce Sirotek Chief Executive Officer 700 Enterprise Street Aurora, IL 60504-8148

Exhibit A

					
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION	Charge	Presented To: A	Agency(ies) Charge No(s):		
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.		FEPA			
Statement and other information before completing this form.	X	EEOC	440-2016-00302		
Illinois Departmen		ıhts	and EEOC		
State or local a	Agency, if any	Home Phone (Incl. Area C	Code) Date of Birth		
Francisco Chavez		(630) 800-693	' 		
	tate and ZIP Code	(000)			
688 Tallgrass Drive, Bolingbrook, IL 60440					
Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprentice Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULA	eship Committee, or S ARS below.)	tate or Local Governmen	nt Agency That I Believe		
Name		No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)		
ILLINOIS AUTO ELECTRIC CO.		15 - 100	(708) 563-2700		
Street Address City, St	tate and ZIP Code				
4750 South Central Avenue, Chicago, IL 60638		Mill Chi. Bathere			
			Control of the second		
Name		No. Employees, Members	Phone No: (Include Area Code)		
			S.		
Street Address City, St	tate and ZIP Code				
	A A				
DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)		1 '	MINATION TOOK PLACE		
RACE COLOR SEX RELIGION	X NATIONAL ORIGI	Earliest N	10-09-2015		
X RETALIATION X AGE DISABILITY OTHER (Specify)	GENETIC INFORMATIO		ONTINUING ACTION		
THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attach extra sheet(s)):					
I began my employment with Respondent in or around Refrigeration Technician. During my employment, I Respondent to no avail. Subsequently, I was subject and discharged. I believe I have been discriminated against because for engaging in protected activity, in violation of Tit I also believe I have I have been discriminated again and in retaliation for engaging in protected activity, Employment Act of 1967, as amended.	was subjected cted to further of of my nationalle VII of the Civerst because of	to discipline. I c discipline. I was a I origin, Hispanio il Rights Act of 1 my age, 58 (D.O.	omplained to also suspended a, and in retaliation 1964, as amended. B. April 2, 1957),		
(want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will experate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their		necessary for State and Loca			
procedures. I swear or affirm that I have read the above charge and that it is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT					
Nov 09, 2015	SUBSCRIBED AND) SWORN TO BEFORE ME	THIS DATE		
Date Charging Party Signature					

February 2, 2016

Re: Francisco Chavez workplace treatment at Illinois Auto Central

The workplace should be a place where you feel that you are treated with respect and fairness. However, while employed at Illinois Auto Central there were many situations that occurred that allowed me to realize that I was being treated unfairly. I never quite understood why I was being singled out, but I always tried to make sure that I was doing my job to the best of my ability. It was important for me to document some of the instances where I felt that I had been treated differently at work and most notably felt that I had been discriminated.

The first situation that I documented, occurred during the month of May 2015, my coworker Mr. Dave Morris was sent to work on a NFI trailer in Joliet, IL, while at the work location, he forgot to take the serial number of a unit, and was not able to repair the unit because he didn't have the parts for it. The same day, they sent me out to the location in Joliet to repair the unit that my co-worker was not able to repair, however, when I got to the customer location the trailer was not there anymore. Although, I did have all the parts for the unit there was no serial number that I could use for the work order, because my co-worker had failed to bring it with him prior to my arrival. Although, my co-worker (Mr. Morris) arrived at the location first and had failed to take the serial number with him originally, he was not written up for not having the serial number that was needed. However in this situation, I was written up for the latter.

In addition, during the month of June 2015, another co-worker, Mr. Lester did some refrigeration repairs on an Idealease, Inc. truck, however two days later the truck was brought back to the shop. One of the reasons it was brought back was because it did not have Freon, therefore I worked on the truck and also repaired some solder joints that were not properly sealed. Mr. Lester was not written up for not properly repairing the solder joints. During the same month of June 2015, Mr. Lester did a comprehensive PM service on a St. Francis Pat Crematory trailer, the trailer came back two days later with a broken drive belt, the unit had a bad crank shaft pulley, but he was also not written up for that. In June 2015, my coworker Mr. Jeremy was sent out to work on a customer trailer, he did some repairs the customer called back half an hour after he left the location, the unit had a thrown out the alternator belt and Mr. Jeremy did not have any repercussions for his actions.

One very important thing to note is that throughout the years while working at Illinois Auto Central, Gladys the service writer always tried to make contacts with different technicians while they were on the road. Her position was to make sure she was in touch with the technicians to ask questions about certain units while the technicians were out. Many times, Gladys couldn't get ahold of certain technicians, because they wouldn't answer their phones. In this instance, only some people (like myself) were written up for failing to answer the phone.

Exhibit B

It really became evident to me that I was really being treated unjustly and unfairly different when at times customers would come back with problems that they were still having on their units that we had worked on. Although there were many technicians that had worked on the different units, it was clear, that most technicians were immune to getting written up for the mistakes that they had made on the units. I was written up, while others who had also had customers come back were not. I discussed this with Mr. Henry and Mr. Sterns (Managers) and they agreed that all technicians made mistakes or missed things on the unit.